



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/692,179 | 10/23/2003 | Daniel A. Henderson | 3052/001 | 6485 |

7590 05/21/2007
Tendler, Robert K.
Law Offices of Robert K. Tendler
65 Atlantic Ave
Boston, MA 02110

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

ANWAH, OLISA

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2614

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

05/21/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/692,179 | HENDERSON, DANIEL A. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Olisa Anwah | 2614 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Olisa Anwah. (3) _____.

(2) Robert Tendler. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 May 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: None.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Olisa Anwah
OA
Patent Examiner
5-16-2007

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In a telephone conference with Applicant's attorney, I told Attorney Tendler that Trina Riddick had indicated that some of the references cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statements did not have the dates for the indicated patents. However, I indicated with my initials that I had considered all of the patents for which there are initials, regardless of the non-citation of the dates and regardless of whether the application number was present and correct on each form, the form submitting the Information Disclosure Statement having had a cover sheet indicating the correct application number. In addition, for the non-patent literature that did not include an adequate date, the literature has nonetheless been considered. Moreover, my lining through the forms did not mean that I had not considered the lined-through references.